

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-2, 6-10, 14-16, and 18 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-18 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Entry Of Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.116

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response because it is believed that the amendment of claims 1-2, 6-10, 14-16, and 18 puts this application into condition for allowance and should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised.

Claim 1 is amended to clarify a method including "dividing, by a computer, a structured document in XML format . . . (and) converting the structured document to a new structured document in XML format." Claims 2, 6-10, 14-16, and 18 are similarly amended. Support for the amendment is found, for example, in Figs. 1 and 8.

Item 8: Rejection Of Claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by O'Neil et al. (US 2003/0110150 A1)

Item 9: Rejection Of Claims 1, 3-9, 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil in view of combinations of Jones (U.S. 2004/0205583) and Kanie et al.

In item 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by O'Neil et al. (US 2003/0110150 A1). (Action at pages 2-4).

In item 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-9, 11-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Neil in view of combinations of Jones (U.S. 2004/0205583) and Kanie et al. (Action at pages 5-13).

The Action concedes that O'Neil does not teach attribute values restricted by a namespace. However, in rejecting claims 1, 3-9, and 11-18, the Examiner contends that since Jones teaches an XML file having an associated namespace that it would have been obvious:

to have combined Jones' teaching of namespace into O'Neil's XML document to associate a namespace to the document, since the combination would have used the namespace for identify the type, (and) the elements of the XML document.

(Action at page 6).

In item 10 of the Office Action in the section entitled Response to Arguments the Examiner asserts that O'Neil's teaching of a Document Object Model (DOM) tree teaches a "representing" by an XML document. (Action at page 13).

The rejections are traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites a method including "dividing, by a computer, a structured document in XML format . . . (and) converting the structured document to a new structured document in XML format." Independent claims 2, 9-10, 16, and 18, all as amended, have similar recitations. That is, each of the independent claims, all as amended herein, (and respective dependent claims) recite a structured document in XML format is converted into another document that is also in XML format.

Applicant submits that such a conversion of a document in XML format into another document also in XML format is not taught by the cited art, alone or in combination.

By contrast, O'Neil merely teaches converting a XML document into a tree structured document. (See, Fig. 4 and paragraphs [0040]-[0047]. The Document Object Model (DOM) tree taught by O'Neil, cited by the Examiner, is not in XML format.

Applicant further submits that there is no reasonable chance of success or incentive to modify O'Neil with Jones and Kanie in a manner as the Examiner contends.

Jones merely teaches (see, for example, paragraph [0002]) that a "namespace is commonly used to uniquely identify each XML document." Kanie merely teaches (see, for example, paragraphs [0056]-[0062] extracting a difference portion and a common portion between an original XML document and an updated XML document to manage a history and does not teach any converting.

By contrast, O' Neil teaches converting a XML document into a Document Object Model (DOM) tree that is not in XML format (see, for example, paragraphs [0040]-[0047]).

Accordingly, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to modify Jones with O'Neil and further there is no reasonable chance of success to add such a namespace to the DOM tree taught by O'Neil in a manner as the Examiner suggests.

Summary

Since features recited by each of the independent claims 1, 2, 9-10, 16, and 18 (and respective dependent claims) are not taught by the cited art and *prima facie* obviousness is not established, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 1-18 allowed.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 16, 2006

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Ave, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501